

OUTPOST

June 2005—Issue #179

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Appeasing Terror

Herbert Zweibon

Even as President Bush and Prime Minister Sharon pose rhetorically as leaders in the no-holds-barred fight against terror, on the ground they pursue the policy of appeasement.

Jerusalem Post editor Caroline Glick sums up the situation: As for Sharon's policy, she writes, "on a psychological level, the images of an Israeli retreat from Gaza and northern Samaria will be footage for *jihadi* recruitment videos for years to come...there can be no doubt that, as attractive as watching helpless hostages getting beheaded may be to potential recruits, the spectacle of Hamas and Fatah flags being foisted onto Israel homes in Gaza and Samaria is even more alluring. And footage of Jews attacking one another as Israel comes apart at the seams will also serve the terrorists' purposes wonderfully well."

But the impact on the United States will also be devastating. As Glick notes, the President has been persuaded by "the know-it-alls from Washington to London to Riyadh...that the Palestinian terror war against Israel has no connection to the global jihad being launched by the likes of 'real' terrorists, such as Osama bin Laden and Abu Musab Zarkawi."

In fact, the two are intimately bound up. In Cairo in March, Glick reminds us, "PA chairman and U.S. favorite Mahmoud Abbas invited the leaders of Hamas, Islamic Jihad and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine--General Command to relocate from Damascus to Gaza after Israel withdraws. How does this square with the U.S. strategy to bar terrorists from receiving shelter?"

Al Qaeda itself, in anticipation of Israel's retreat, is setting up shop in Gaza. In *FrontPageMagazine.com* P. David Hornik quotes a *Jerusalem Post* report by Khaled Abu Toameh citing PA security officials who say a new terrorist group called *Jundallah* ("Allah's Brigades") with close ties to Al-Qaeda has started operating in Gaza. U.S. counter-terrorism officials have testified that Hamas is merging with elements of Al Qaeda.

The Administration response? More pressure on Israel, more money for the PA; a fulsome White House welcome for Mahmoud Abbas with President Bush heaping praise on him for "rejecting violence" and calling on Israel to retreat to the 1949 borders (any changes "must be mutually agreed to," i.e. will not happen). This is despite the fact that nothing has changed under Abbas: there is the same vicious incitement in the media; terror organizations flourish unchecked; Abbas himself just prior to his White House junket called the creation of Israel "the greatest crime in human history" and has used the ceasefire to upgrade the PA's terror capabilities. The President even ignores Abbas's direct spit in the American eye. On May 1 *Al-Khayat Al-Jadida*, a newspaper Abbas controls, declared: "Blessing to Saddam Hussein the faithful, the legal President of the Republic, on the occasion of his 68th Birthday...We wish him...to free the Arab nation from [U.S.] foreign imperialism."

As Caroline Glick writes, "What will happen to the Arab democrats from Baghdad to Damascus to Beirut to Riyadh when they are force-fed footage of mosques being built on synagogues in Gush Katif 24/7?...Will they be willing to stick their necks out when they see how America lets Israel, its ally, lose?...It is impossible to sustain an argument that...Israel's withdrawal from Gaza will do anything other than strengthen the cause of global *jihad* and Arab authoritarianism. Unfortunately, until the U.S. abandons the contrived belief that what happens to Israel has no connection to what happens to the U.S., it will be unable to see -- and thus thwart -- the dangers that await it."

In This Issue

The Missing Moral Dimension	
by Roger A. Gerber	...3
A Rejected Constitution by Nidra Poller	...6
Madame Secretary, Do Your Homework	
by Hugh Fitzgerald	...7
The War on What? by Zack Lieberberg	...9
More on the AUT Boycott by Ruth King	...10

From the Editor

The Rot Goes Deeper

The rot in American policy goes even deeper than that described in Herbert Zweibon's editorial. Olivier Guitta reports that the Arab media have been buzzing with the revelation that the Bush administration is engaging in open talks with Islamists, including Islamic terror groups. For example, in Beirut on March 22 U.S. officials met with representatives from Hamas, Hezbollah, and (the Lebanese and Pakistan-based) Gamaa Islamiya. Azzam Al-Tanimi, head of the Institute of Islamic Political Thought in London, who took part in the meeting, explained the U.S. about-face as a new realism: Americans know that in a democratic process, the Islamists will win.

Both Israel and the U.S. sooner or later will pay the bitter price for appeasement. Israel has yet to fully pay for its helter skelter flight from southern Lebanon five years ago; that payment will come when northern Israel comes under the rain of the 12,000 rockets which Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah openly boasts it has installed along the border, capable of attacking all of northern Israel. Part of the price of that same exercise in terrorist-appeasement has already been paid: it has been the encouragement of terrorism in Judea, Samaria and Gaza -- of which the euphemistically styled "disengagement" from Gaza is the most recent achievement.

And the aftermath of the eviction of Jewish communities will make the effect of the Lebanon collapse seem trivial. Already Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz has warned the cabinet that Palestinian security forces have smuggled into Gaza, from Egypt, Strella anti-aircraft missiles capable of shooting down both commercial and military aircraft. In January Israeli intelligence chief Avi Dichter told the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that if Israel relinquishes control over the Philadelphi Corridor linking Gaza to the Sinai (which Israel has since announced it is doing) the current "trickle" of arms coming into Gaza from Egypt will become a "river."

Mistreating the Koran.

Nothing better illustrates Moslem arrogance than the riots over the alleged flushing of the Koran down a toilet at Guantanamo. The story turned out to be untrue (as one pundit observed, it should never have passed *Newsweek's* initial smell test, given the obvious impossibility of flushing that lengthy volume down an environmentally correct toilet that has problems accommodating a modest dose of human waste). But apart from *Newsweek's* folly, what business do Moslems have being outraged? Saudis routinely shred Bibles, as well as Korans printed outside the kingdom, confiscating them on entry into the country; Moslems have no hesitation in destroying Jewish cemeteries -- after 1949, the Jordanians used Jewish

headstones for latrines; suicide bombers expect a divine reward for blowing up churches (and churchgoers) in Iraq. Moslems seem to have no problem desecrating the Koran when it will discomfit Westerners. It emerges what really did happen at Guantanamo was that a Moslem used pages of the Koran to stuff up a toilet to annoy his guards.

What is most disturbing is the U.S. response: we act like Eurabians when we let these morally infantile people get away with their shamelessness. Thus Condoleeza Rice waxes indignant about the very thought of disrespect to "the Holy Koran." She could have said we respect the fact that the Koran is holy to a large segment of the world's population. But the Holy Koran? It is not holy to Christians like Ms. Rice and it is *dhimmitude* to use that phrase. If she had referred to "the Holy Bible" the ACLU would probably have forced her to apologize.

Criticizing Islam Outlawed

In what has rightly been called an act of total insanity, at the urging of Turkey, the Council of Europe has decided to ban criticism of Islam, equating it with anti-Semitism.

But as Moslem-born dissident Ali Sina observes on his website www.faithfreedom.org, anti-Islamism is not the same as anti-Semitism. People, not doctrines, must be protected. Prohibiting criticism of Islam is like prohibiting criticism of Judaism or Christianity. "Only during the Inquisition was criticism of Christianity against the law. Are we trying to introduce an Islamic inquisition to appease Muslims? Are we trying to institute the blasphemy law that is practiced in Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Iran to make Muslims happy?" Al Sina notes that the Quran itself calls those who are not Muslims *najis*, which means filthy, untouchable impure. Should we then ban the Quran? How can we condemn anti-Semitism if we are not allowed to criticize Islam that incites hatred of the Jews and says God transformed them into swine and apes?

Nonetheless, on May 25 an Italian judge in Bergamo ordered journalist Oriana Fallaci to stand trial in her native Italy on charges she defamed Islam in her book *La Forza della Ragione* (The Force of Reason). The president of the Muslim Union of Italy
Continued on page 12

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel
Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128
tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

The Missing Moral Dimension

Roger A. Gerber

The controversial "disengagement" plan proposed by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has precipitated, in the words of Yossi Klein Halevi, "one of the most severe domestic crises in Israeli history." In fact, writes Halevi in the current *Azure*, "the result could be a schism so profound that the Jews of Israel will no longer feel bound by a common destiny." In January, 2005 Caroline Glick, the respected columnist for *The Jerusalem Post*, wrote: "Major cultural icons like Yair Lapid have demonized the settlers, extolling the virtues of a civil war. Lapid argues that such a war would not be a war between brothers because, as far as he's concerned, anyone who wants to stay in Gaza, Judea and Samaria and opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state is no longer to be considered a "real" Israeli and hence is no longer part of the family. Prime Minister Sharon, in a recent interview on NBC television, made the astonishing assertion that "One should not underestimate the tension here, the atmosphere here. It looks like on the eve of a civil war."

In attempting to comprehend the apocalyptic atmosphere, analysts typically focus on the security, geo-strategic, economic, and political ramifications of Sharon's plan but omit the attendant burning moral issues. Yet, it is the moral dimension that accounts for the depth and intensity of the passions that have been aroused by the plan that Sharon conceived, as he recounted to William Safire, "in consultation with myself."

Under what moral or legal principle does a democratic government expel by force from their homes and businesses 25 communities populated by its own citizens for the sole reason that they are Jewish? Pursuant to what principle does the government tell the citizens of Kfar Darom who reside on former swamp land purchased almost a century ago, that they are to be forcibly evicted? Even if the government were to decide for political reasons to withdraw the IDF from Gaza and the northern Shomron (and I wish to make clear that I agree with Daniel Pipes' appraisal of the "disengagement" plan as "an act of monumental political folly"), the awesome power of the state to deprive its own citizens of their freedom to remain in their homes and communities should be circumscribed. Under what moral principle must disputed land be made "Judenrein"? Prime Minister Sharon declared last year that there will be "no Jews in Gaza by the end of 2005", a rather curious desideratum to be enunciated by a Jewish prime minister of a democratic Jewish State, as if it would be inconceivable for Jews to live in an area relinquished to Pales-

tinian Arab control. (Sharansky and others have pointed out that if it is impossible to conceive of Jews living in an area under Palestinian control then that area should not be relinquished to Palestinian control in the first place).

In a speech on the floor of the United Nations some years ago, then Ambassador Chaim Herzog asked why he should be "forbidden to settle on land of a village in the Hebron Hills, Masuot Yitzhak, which bears my late father's name and which is Jewish owned, for one reason and one reason only: because I happen to be a member of the Jewish People." In their failure to grapple with these moral issues, the various commentators can neither comprehend nor convey to their readers the nature and depth of the

opposition to the euphemistically named "disengagement" plan. (As David Bedein has pointed out, Sharon's plan, while expelling Jewish communities and withdrawing Israel's army from Gaza and northern Samaria, envisions intertwining Israel and Palestinian lives in numerous ways including industrial zones, supplying utilities, and various other economic arrangements) For this plan, unlike other controversial legislation that periodically roils the Israeli political scene, strikes at the heart of basic moral codes, both Jewish religious and secular Zionist imperatives, and raises fundamental questions of democracy and the legitimacy of Israel itself.

Perhaps most telling is the lack of a single historical precedent for

the planned expulsions of the 25 Jewish towns by a democratic government. (Some have attempted to draw a specious analogy to the concept of eminent domain in American law, which entails a public taking by "due process" for a "public purpose" with "just compensation," and typically involves a lengthy and time-consuming process of judicial review. A major eminent domain case currently before the Supreme Court, *Kelo v. New London*, has been wending its way through the judicial system for almost five years.) Therefore, it would seem that the Government of Israel has a heavy burden of establishing the reasons for the implementation of such a draconian plan, particularly when it is aware that it has opened a dangerous chasm in the nation.

Notwithstanding this burden to forge a consensus, the prime minister has elected to refrain from giving even one single nationwide address to explain the reasoning behind his proposal; he has ducked out of a planned debate with MK Uzi Landau on the specious grounds that the parties were unable to agree on

Prime Minister Sharon made the astonishing assertion that "One should not underestimate the tension here. It looks like on the eve of a civil war."

modalities for the debate; in his interviews on the subject he has merely recited a series of conclusory statements, such as the "disengagement" will help the economy and security, but without any supporting reasoning or factual data. The prime minister has also failed to articulate a vision for a post-withdrawal and post-expulsion Israel riven by the shock of the Sharon plan.

A concomitant serious adverse consequence has been the stifling of dissent and the acceleration of the decline of democratic norms in Israel that began with the ill fated Oslo process, dubbed by Sharon "the deepest mistake that any government has done, bringing over here thousands of armed terrorists." Writing in *Commentary*, Hillel Halkin asserts that "if the opposition to disengagement has been stifled, I for one have failed to notice". Apparently Mr. Halkin does not view as "stifling" dissent Prime Minister Sharon's public statement that "those opposed to the disengagement are involved in incitement," or the unprecedented dismissal by Sharon, prior to the cabinet vote on "disengagement," of two cabinet ministers whom he knew to be opposed. Minister Natan Sharansky, at a cabinet meeting, remarked that "it is frightening to see how an entire public of law-abiding citizens who oppose the disengagement are being delegitimized." What Sharansky regards as "frightening" Halkin views with complete equanimity.

Halkin also asserts that he "knows of no one in Israel who has been threatened or intimidated for adding his voice" to the opposition to Sharon's plan -- this despite numerous reported cases of police harassment and arrest of demonstrators against the "disengagement," while permitting similar demonstrations in favor. In one recent incident, the police forced a group of eighth graders who were attempting to distribute anti-disengagement stickers and flyers to return to their bus and ordered the bus driver to return to his point of origin. When Sarah Baumol and her son's eighth grade class attempted to pray at the Western Wall at the conclusion of a class trip, police required the children to remove orange tee shirts and orange bracelets worn in support of the Jewish residents of Gaza. In an especially ludicrous incident, Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom was forced to issue an official apology to the Indian Embassy after Knesset security personnel required visiting Indian legislators to remove their orange scarves in order to enter the Knesset;

orange is the official color of the party to which the visiting Indians belong. "I found it to be ridiculous not to allow a piece of cloth," one of the Indian delegation members told Army Radio. "Those are messages of intolerance. Today it's cloth, and soon it could be ideas that are barred."

The election of 2003 in Israel did not entail a direct election of prime minister; Ariel Sharon took office as the leader of the Likud party and his obligation of fidelity to the Likud platform is vastly greater than in the American political system where the president is elected directly. The platform in 2003 assumed an even greater significance since the leader of the Labor Party, Amram Mitzna, proposed a unilateral withdrawal from Gaza which was forcefully rejected by Sharon. In fact, following the election, which resulted in a Likud landslide victory, Sharon and Mitzna met to see whether a unity government was possible. As reported by *Haaretz*, Mitzna stated that he was "shocked" by Sharon's refusal to consider evacuating the Gaza settlements; Mitzna stated that at the meeting with Sharon he "heard a lecture on the strategic impor-

tance of Netzarim and the historic importance of Kfar Darom ... and I came out even more worried than when I went into the meeting."

Subsequently, when Sharon made a sudden and inexplicable U-turn and essentially adopted Mitzna's proposal, many commentators including Sharon's long-time supporter and confidant, Uri Dan, advocated a referendum on the Gaza plan. Uri Dan wrote that "only a referendum will restore to Sharon the moral-political legitimacy needed to execute his plan;" failure to do so, Dan wrote in *The Jerusalem Post*, would risk "failure at the national-strategic level" and having the plan "becoming a tragicomedy."

Even Yoel Marcus, the prominent *Haaretz* columnist and a stalwart supporter of "disengagement", wrote that the Sharon government's procedures have engendered "this gnawing feeling of disgust inside me." He went on to say that "one must admit that the process itself was not entirely democratic." Marcus points out that Sharon has never explained why the unilateral Gaza plan is now a good thing for Israel when he strongly rejected the plan when introduced by Mitzna. Nor, it might be added, has Sharon explained why he labels Uzi Landau and other opponents of his plan "extremists" for stating essentially the same arguments that Sharon himself made just two years ago in



the election campaign against Mitzna. [It may be difficult for an American, who is accustomed to presidential speeches to the nation, press conferences and in depth congressional hearings on matters of major public policy, to comprehend that none of these things occurred during the formulation, or adoption, of Sharon's unprecedented plan.]

The question has been posed by those who do not understand the prevailing norms of Israel's media establishment as to why have the numerous instances of police excess and government overreaching not been reported by the press. Former prime minister, and a likely candidate for leadership of the Labor Party, Ehud Barak, a supporter of withdrawal from Gaza and most of the other disputed territories, recently stated that, when it comes to the Sharon plan, "the media are remaining mute, people are not talking about the situation as it really is. There is no true reporting and there is no true debate and there is no true discourse. Everything is being kept under wraps. Everything is being kept in a state of fogginess."

One can only surmise the reasons for the obfuscation, but Barak believes that "Sharon's fogginess is intended to avoid speaking the truth and to avoid having to cope with the truth." The truth to which Barak refers is that Sharon is misleading Israel into believing that he obtained a U.S. commitment to retain major settlement blocs in Judea and Samaria despite the fact that President Bush has made it clear that U.S. policy requires Palestinian Arab consent to any changes in the 1949 armistice lines. Is not this avoidance of the truth the inevitable result of Sharon's failure to address the moral dimension of his plan?

The prime minister and his confidant, Ehud Olmert, have said that the withdrawal and expulsion plan is not limited to Gaza and the four specified northern Samarian communities. On his recently concluded visit to the U.S., Sharon stated that, although "the major Israeli population centers in Judea and Samaria will remain" in Israel, the status of other areas of the disputed territories are subject to the "final phase of the permanent agreement negotiations and talks." In the context of Olmert's earlier remarks that the four northern Samarian settlements "will not be the last, but only the beginning of withdrawals from Judea and Samaria," Sharon's elliptical statements presage further divisive moral battles.

Sharon seems to have the attitude toward the Jewish citizens of Judea and Samaria publicly enunciated by Ami Ayalon, sponsor of the dovish "People's Voice Initiative" and an enthusiastic supporter of Sharon's plan, who stated when asked whether he would favor evacuation of an Arab village as Sharon's plan envisions for 25 Jewish towns, "There's a differ-

ence. You [the settlers] are public servants and we sent you. The mission of some of you has ended." This high handed approach may reflect Ayalon's background as a distinguished Israeli naval commander accustomed to giving orders, but it surely ignores both the facts (the settlers are not "public servants" nor were they "sent", as on a military mission; in some cases, such as at Kfar Darom, the inhabitants purchased their land prior to the creation of the State of Israel.) and the moral considerations attendant on expelling entire communities for reasons of ethnic identity. Ayalon's remarks are illustrative of the moral obtuseness of much of Israeli officialdom.

Observers of Israel have frequently been struck by the prevailing attitude that neither ideas nor words are of great consequence. Thus, it was not surprising that when American leaders of Israel Bonds pointed out to Sharon in May of this year that the Palestinian Arabs are describing the withdrawal and expulsions as a victory, Sharon replied: "So what if they say so? What is important are the facts and not what they will say. On our side also there are people who say things they should not. So what? Does it make the Jews any weaker?" Of course, the Palestinian Arab perception of victory will not only boost their morale and encourage further violence on their part but will aid in recruiting additional terrorists.

In summary, Sharon's firing of ministers who indicated that they would vote against his "disengagement" plan in the cabinet, his insistence upon a Likud party plebiscite which he pledged to honor when it appeared he would win and then promptly ignored when he lost overwhelmingly, his refusal to conduct a referendum, his failure to explain to the nation the reasons and goals of his traumatic plan, his incitement to violence by describing Israel as on the verge of a civil war, his delegitimization of the respected Likud leader and Knesset member Uzi Landau and other opponents as "extremists" for basically taking the same position he took in the national election less than two years previously, and his callous disregard of the trampling on the rights of citizens of Israel who disagree with his withdrawal and expulsion plan, have seriously diminished the ethos of democracy in the State of Israel. It is this diminution of democracy in Israel, together with the avoidance of coping with the truth described by Ehud Barak and the "gnawing feeling of disgust" reported by Yoel Marcus, that has, sadly, weakened the cohesion of Israeli society, divided Israel "in ways that may poison the body politic for decades" in the words of Daniel Pipes, and undermined the moral fabric of the nation.

Roger A. Gerber's most recent article for Outpost was "The Chimerical Moderation of Mahmoud Abbas."

Observers of Israel have frequently been struck by the prevailing attitude that neither ideas nor words are of great consequence.

A Rejected Constitution

Nidra Poller

To the surprise and dismay of mainstream political leaders on both right and left, French voters voted "No" in the May 29th referendum to ratify the treaty to establish a European Constitution. French rejection will put a halt to the forward march of the European Union — given the current state of European society, a good thing for the forward march of democracy.

What exactly is this Treaty for the establishment of a Constitution? The document is long and indigestible. Brave souls have in fact read it, specialists have analyzed it, but no compelling arguments are based on its intrinsic qualities. The choice morsels



Jacques Chirac

were spoon fed to TV audiences in sober clips that opened with the blue flag and its circle of stars, asked a question, then answered it with low fat citations from this or that Article. The immediate effect was soothing and reassuring.

But that was not the image that emerged from conversations with friends, acquaintances, neighbors, waiters, shopkeepers and their customers over the weeks preceding the vote. The overall impression was doubt and dismay. Formal aspects of the Constitution faded into the background. People explained that the French have to vote *oui* so we won't look like cons (asses)... So we won't be isolated... Because there's no alternative, we have to go forward. They rarely mentioned a single detail about the type of government that would be established by this Constitution.

Some undecided voters seemed to be haunted by a very real disappointment in Europe as experienced in their daily lives. Not sure whether this Constitution, whatever it is, will make things better or worse, and unsure of where to place the blame--on Europe or on their own government or on the proverbial bad French character--for what they see as a general degradation of their situation, they feel vaguely disenfranchised. On the other side of the question, among the yea sayers, were self-confident, well-dressed, modern ladies and gentlemen who walk with a sure step in a modern world. They are not afraid of the future, feel at home in a globalized world, welcome competition...and probably will welcome Turkey into the EU with the same breezy confidence. They disparage retrograde voters who think they can opt out of Europe and snuggle cozily into a safe little France.

They would almost be convincing -- were it not for the dark clouds looming over Europe. If, instead of trudging through the Constitution, one reads the 43-

page report drafted in 2003 by the High Level Advisory Group appointed by then European Commission President Romano Prodi, an utterly different picture emerges. The Euro-Mediterranean "Dialogue" is a masterpiece of abject surrender. The European Union functions therein as an intermediate stage of an ominous Eurabian project that calls for a meltdown of European culture and its recasting in a monumental paradise of cultural relativism...that closely resembles the Muslim *umma*. Isn't this a more accurate vision of what the Union is preparing for its docile citizens? When subversive appeasement hides behind the veil of "Dialogue," what unspeakable ambitions might be dissembled by the noble word "Constitution"?

If, as claimed, the Constitutional Treaty is a giant step forward in the creation of a United States of Europe, what exactly is the political system it enshrines? The sleek answer is: something better than what we've had this far. More United, more European, looking more like a government, stronger, able to speak with one voice and (explicitly or implicitly) heavy enough to counterbalance the overweening hyperpulsant arch-rival--the USA. Jack Lang, former socialist Minister of Culture, vaunts the Constitution: it will make Europe strong enough to stand up to China, India, the United States.

Behind the sturdy images of a forthright Europe on the road to a bright future lurks the shadow of a shameful anti-Semitism that has soaked into the very skin of European society. Economic stagnation and plus 10% unemployment eats away at France's elegant foundations. Life has become harsh, violence of all sorts is on the rise. The strong euro is no help to French wage earners. Social services are breaking down. Anti-war pro-Palestinian anti-American activism has not even brought hollow victories. Man can not live by bluster alone.

Democracy is leaking out of this tattered Europe. As national sovereignty is handed up to the higher echelons of the European Union, citizens lose their grip on the affairs of state. For all its brand name institutions--parliament, executive, commission, president and now secretary of state--the EU does not have a democratic infrastructure. It is recreating something like an old fashioned European empire where the ruling classes hobnob together in feasts and palaces, and dictate their will to the people. In the absence of grass roots power, commoners, with no constructive means of expression, resort to the sullen refusal to work, freedom to throw a monkey wrench into the system, go on strike on a holiday weekend, burn down an occasional factory. Some serious analysts of the Constitutional Treaty describe it as a blueprint for gridlock. Neither streamlined nor democratic, a far cry from a system of checks and balances, it in-

stitutionalizes ingrained European mistrust; every initiative will be vulnerable to blockage regardless of its scope or thrust. Good old fashioned power politics will be played on the ruins of this fictitious harmony. And France still seems to cherish dreams of grandeur.

When all of this is said and done, is it good for the Jews? According to Claude Barouch, president of the UPJF (Jewish entrepreneurs and professionals union...that aspires to be a Jewish lobby in France) a stronger, more united Europe will be kinder to Israel, less biased in favor of the Palestinians, more mature and responsible; economically France has everything to gain from a stronger more assertive Europe; new member states will have a positive effect both economically and politically. He advised us to vote *oui*.

But a little handmade, unscientific, offbeat public opinion poll in my immediate vicinity contradicted this optimistic vision. Many people told me they planned to vote *non* to sanction Europe, with France in the forefront, for fomenting anti-Semitism, delegitimizing Israel, aligning itself with the enemies of the United States, and pandering to Yassir Arafat all his life, until his death, and beyond. When Eurodeputy François Zimeray succeeded, against overwhelming opposition, in mobilizing a demand for investigation of the use of

EU funds generously donated to the Palestinians, the EU Commission sidetracked the investigation, whitewashed the PA. And Zimeray's party kicked him down stairs and out of the Parliament. Europe, with no credible military defense, gloats in demonizing the United States and Israel because they stand up to Islamic *jihad*. And even before the Constitution is ratified, the European Commission has chosen the infamous Javier Solana as European Foreign Minister.

Is there any common measure between the grouchy vote of nostalgic crypto-peasants and the "parochial" vote of French Jews and neo-conservatives who want to stop the European machine in its tracks? Many voters said *non* to the Treaty for the establishment of a European Constitution because they believe in democracy, cherish Europe's Jewish and Christian values, and trust national sovereignty more than EU oligarchy. For these *non* voters, the Treaty for a Constitution is more like a Munich agreement and nothing like the timeless, elegant, document framed by America's Founding Fathers.

Nidra Poller is a novelist and journalist who lives in France.

Madame Secretary, Do Your Homework

Hugh Fitzgerald

U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice recently cited Turkey as a model showing that "Islam, the Muslim world and democracy" do not contradict each other. And in a speech to the members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Rice said: "I think Islam, the Muslim world, is indeed going through an evolution, and as with any evolution there are both potential negative outcomes and potential positive outcomes. The negative outcome would be the continued rise of extremism and those who would hijack the great world religion to a cause that clearly has nothing to do with Islam. Islam is a peaceful religion..."



If Rice means what she said, she is a grave disappointment. And neither she, nor anyone else who thinks in the same vein, is likely to be able to comprehend how much vaster is the problem than anything bringing "democracy to Iraq" will solve. Let us stick only to Turkey, since Rice raises it as an example. Indeed, Turkey is an example. But of what? The historical record shows the following:

1) Kemal Ataturk was a war hero and strongman who took full control of Turkey -- which was not a

democracy at the time -- in order to save his country from what he regarded as further disaster and possible dismemberment (it had already lost its possessions) in 1924.

He instituted a series of measures designed to limit the power of Islam in political and social matters. These included:

a) the Hat Act. This abolished the wearing of the brimless fez which made praying easier and insisted on Western caps to go with such Western, non-Islamic dress as coats and ties.

b) giving women the right to vote.

c) having the Qur'an translated into Turkish -- to break the cultural hold of Arabic -- and even supplying a special *tafsir*, or commentary in Turkish.

d) ending the use of Arabic script and adopting the Western alphabet.

e) monitoring the mosques and creating a Ministry of Religious Affairs entrusted with composing the *khutbas* delivered at Friday Prayers -- carefully vetted by government officials so that they would not contain any dangerous material.

f) forbidding conscripts in the army from rising in the ranks if they demonstrated any detectable signs of religious fervor, such as reading the Qur'an too much.

g) forbidding the wearing of the *hijab* in any government office or at any official function.

h) cracking down on any newspapers that offered articles deemed "pro-Islamic."

i) making the army the bastion and protector of Kemalism.

And much more.

Note that Ataturk did not try to change the text of Qur'an. Nor did he try to de-authenticate dangerous hadith. Nor did he try to re-write the life of Muhammad. (In some ways the cult of Ataturk, now the national cult of Turkey, was a kind of replacement for Muhammad.) He realized that this was impossible, but that in order to bring Turkey kicking and screaming into the modern world (Turkey was poor, Turkey was on the ropes, Turkey needed a Strong Man and as a war hero he fit the bill perfectly), he and those who supported him had to force through all these constraints on Islam.

2) Turkey offers another lesson; Kemalism requires constant vigilance for it to be maintained. Even though a secular class has been created in Turkey, that class has been insufficiently aware of how tenuous its position is, and of how it is constantly in danger of being chipped away at, and undermined, by the determined "Islamic" element in Turkey. Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan is not an example of someone admirable, but of someone exceedingly cunning. He is able to use the E.U.'s requirements to hobble the army, the sole guarantor of Kemalism

The undermining of Kemalism in Turkey offers a salutary lesson: that Islam is a powerful force, and cannot be changed, only constrained. And to the degree that any country becomes more Muslim, to that same degree that country will -- no matter how long or close its seemingly heartfelt alliance with the United States has been -- pull away from that alliance, forget all that was done for it, and become hostile to the United States, as it would be to any Infidel power practicing muscular self-defense. The same is true of Pakistan. Neither country can be trusted to be on America's side, no matter how plausible some Turkish generals in Ankara may seem (or may be) to their American counterparts, or how many ramrod-straight Sandhurst graduates in Karachi manage to impress, or at least try to make us overlook, how Pakistani generals were in up to their neck in supporting the Taliban and the extracurricular activities of that remarkable man, A. Q. Khan.

3) The example of Turkey shows that Islam can only be constrained by a strong man rather than by "democracy" -- for a "democratic" state where the people are almost entirely Muslim will inevitably re-define everything in terms of Islam. Whatever is bad -- i.e., corruption -- will simply be defined as "Infidel" and therefore to be opposed. Whatever is desirable will simply be labeled in the spirit of Islam -- and this will happen everywhere that head-counting is the accepted definition of democracy, and not head-counting plus the rights enshrined in the First and Fourteenth Amendments, or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Condoleeza Rice has been misled. That is not

her fault. Many people have been misled about Islam. But at some point they must realize that the evidence of their senses suggests that they have been fed an incorrect analysis, a "theory" or "model" of Islam that does not explain all the data we have collected over 1350 years, nor seems to have much explanatory value for what is happening now, not only in Iraq and with Israel, but in the Sudan, in Nigeria, in Pakistan, in the Philippines, in Indonesia, in Bangladesh.

Perhaps the entire political class in this country is guilty -- Republicans and Democrats alike -- of failing to learn about Islam, and failing to offer imaginative and intelligent means to resist it. These means do not require vast invasion forces on the ground. Nor do they require the spending of hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq and tens of billions more, apparently, in Afghanistan -- not to mention the continuation of American aid, for no good reason, to Egypt, to Jordan, to Pakistan, and of course to the shock-troops of the relentless Arab *Jihad* against Israel, the local Arabs renamed the "Palestinian people."

Never before have we so needed leaders willing to take the time to study, to return to their books, to be willing to jettison prefabricated phrases about "tolerance" and "peace" and to be willing to understand some very unpleasant truths. It is not asking too much of our leaders to ask them not to dismiss the dangers of Islam, and to request that they study not the apologists but the real scholars (a book or article on Islam written in 1920 or 1930 does not lose value, and because it was written at a time of much less inhibition, in a less guarded and fearful language, it is likely to be of far greater

value than what is written today.) Intelligence and imagination will allow them to come up, very easily, with a dozen ideas that will help to weaken Islam, to exploit its natural fissures, to visibly limit its present and future economic power, and to support, within Europe, those who are now thoroughly alarmed and intent on stopping the spread of a belief-system that is totalitarian in its Total Regulation and Total Explanation of the Universe.

Surely that is something that can be understood by some in the army and in the civilian administration -- and can percolate not downwards, but upwards -- from those who still have the time to do their own studying, and do not have to rely on 2-5 page summaries prepared by aides.

Long live the colonels who educate the generals. Long live the staff aides who educate the Senators and Congressmen. And long live all those who take the time to read, study, and think.

It is they who will rescue us.

Hugh Fitzgerald is a frequent contributor to Outpost.

The undermining of Kemalism offers a salutary lesson: that Islam is a powerful force, and cannot be changed, only constrained.

The War on What?

Zack Lieberberg

Russian people are incredibly rude. They are so rude that even when they make an effort to be polite, they sound threatening. And when they want to sound threatening, it comes out perfectly believable. When Prime Minister Putin, his face still burning after the heavy slap he had received at Beslan, announced to the world that from then on he intended to strike terrorists preventively on Russian territory as well as beyond, I said to myself, Uh-oh. We've got ourselves an ally that may cause more problems than all our enemies combined. As it turned out, I had nothing to worry about. In the almost 19 months since the siege that left more than 344 hostages, 172 of them children, dead, Putin has been carefully emulating his more experienced colleagues. Like Sharon, he went after terrorist leaders and managed to kill a couple of them. These tough measures did about as much good to Russia as they do to Israel. The only difference was that the world did not defend the Chechen terrorists' sacred right to kill and maim their victims with the same passion they usually defend the Arab terrorists' sacred right to kill and maim theirs.

Like President Bush, Putin managed to indict just a single participant in the attack. The man is currently on trial. As far as striking terrorists goes, Putin summoned all the self-discipline a martial arts expert can possibly master and managed to contain his vengeful urges. Instead of fighting a war against terrorists, he proceeded to sell modern weapons and nuclear technology to the worst terrorist states in the world. That's his war on terror.

What about ours? It forges ahead. Iraqis enthusiastically kill each other. Unfortunately, they also kill American soldiers, but their sacrifices do not seem to produce any tangible benefits for this country or the remnants of the free world. The price of gas has reached a plateau twice as high as its pre-war level. The terror alert indicator has been frozen in the middle of the scale for such a long time that most people no longer remember if it has a meaning.

The original goal of defeating terrorism has been substituted with a pipe dream of bringing democracy to primitive peoples who harbor an old, deep, incurable hatred towards us simply because we happen to be non-Muslims, and the fact that we are so much more advanced and lead so much better lives only makes their hatred burn ever brighter. Even if democracy and Islam were not mutually exclusive in principle, the question remains, how would this make the United States any safer than we are today? And if it wouldn't, then we should ask what concrete steps our government has undertaken to diminish the terrorists' capacity to threaten this country and its citizens. The establishment of the Department of Homeland Security and other reorganizations within the government bureaucracy has so far failed to bring down the terror

alert indicator, much less produce any tangible results, so I will not count them in. Liberal media regularly publish tearful stories about unwarranted restrictions imposed on good Muslims by the bad government of the United States, but I see too many of those good Muslims in the streets to believe that these atrocities may have put a dent into *jihad*. Astronomically expensive efforts to improve the security of our airports have been easily sabotaged by politically-correct government policies, which, basically speaking, mean that my chances to smuggle a bomb on board an aircraft are better if I wear a *keffiyeh* and scream *allah akhbar!* during the security check.

Once in a long while we hear of a Muslim charity shut down for financing terrorism. Its runners receive a slap on the wrist and continue collecting donations for *jihad* under another phony name. Does this put even a dent into financing terror? How can it if the United States government is probably the second, after the European Union, most generous donor to the Palestinian Authority? Or are we the first? The PA is the PLO; it has the same leaders, the same members, the same goals, and applies the same atrocious means towards achieving its murderous ends. Therefore, the PA is a terrorist organization. Therefore, it is our enemy. As of now, this enemy remains undefeated. Would the US government consider providing humanitarian aid to the German population before the date for D-Day was even chosen?

A war is supposed to be a process. It goes on for a while. Then one side wins, the other one loses, and everyone who didn't get killed, moves on. Our War on Terror is no longer a process. It has become a state. A permanent state. We may succeed in replacing a government we don't like with a government we hope to be able to control. Trying to make it look legitimate, we may succeed in putting together a semblance of elections that can win Jimmy Carter's endorsement. But the government we are hoping to control will inevitably bend to pressure from the people who hate us more than they love their own children. The democracy we are trying to build among the cave-men will never take root. *Jihad* will continue unabated as long as Islam is allowed to wage its war against us.

In the immediate aftermath of Beslan, a diplomat accredited at the UN was on TV gravely expanding on terrorism and related matters. He was asked why the UN hadn't taken any steps against the Chechen "militants."

"It is so complicated," the diplomat complained. "Those people are not controlled by any government."

"Bingo!" I thought. I suddenly saw how simple it was to define terrorism: Terrorism is a military action conducted by a non-governmental organization. Armed with this definition, we can now declare terror-

ism a capital offense. You participate in it — you are liable to be killed on sight, no questions asked, and no statute of limitation. No more humanitarian assistance to the murderers. No more invitations to the White House. No more hiding in the Mukata, in Paris, or even at Berkeley. Just an uncomplicated choice between death in battle and death on the gallows. Had we the honesty to implement it, how long do you think terrorism would have remained the favorite weapon of *jihad*? Oh, Muslims would no doubt have thought of something else, because there is no Islam without *jihad*, but we would find efficient ways to deal with anything they could possibly bring up against us. It's not that we don't have the power to end *jihad*; the problem is, we are not willing to.

Why will my definition of terrorism never be

accepted? Because it would give Israel legal means to stop the unending Arab war against it, and this is exactly what the international community is determined to prevent. The world wants Israel destroyed. As a result, terrorism remains undefeated and behaves like untreated cancer — it spreads, leading to Beslan, to Madrid, to 9/11.

Do we need another 9/11 to finally wake us up? Or have we become completely incapable of doing the right thing even if our survival, the survival of our country and our entire magnificent civilization depends on it? Can we still tell right from wrong?

Zack Lieberberg is a Russian-born mathematician living in New York. This article was translated from the Russian by Yashiko Sagamori

More on the AUT Boycott

Ruth King

I received the following letter from Professor William Firshein of Wesleyan University.

"The boycott by the Association of University Teachers in England was overturned.. I say big deal!... An excruciating effort was mounted to reverse what should never have been considered in the first place except for the barely contained anti-Semitic views of those who first organized the boycott. It is just one more of the everlasting steps (a blip really) to delegitimize Israel if not by actual warfare -- which the Arabs have failed miserably to accomplish time after time -- then by what David Pryce Jones calls "psychological warfare" where the success has been palpable.

From the equating of Zionism with racism to the comparison of Israel to apartheid South Africa, to perhaps the most despicable, the likening of Israel's right of self defense by the IDF to Nazis committing genocide....it is a sickening manifestation of a growing acceptance by the governing bodies and rank and file of so many "righteous" groups including the International Red Cross, many members of the United Nations (did you hear that El Salvador has just named a prominent plaza in their capitol after Arafat?), the European Union, many Protestant churches, and of course, last but not least, faculty at many Universities ... that Israel has no right to exist.

I truly do not know how all this will end, but it sickens me that we have to continue to fight these calumnies.

Bill Firshein
Department of Molecular Biology and
Biochemistry
Wesleyan University
Middletown, Conn

I too would not pop the cork on the champagne. And it is important to recognize that some who fought the boycott were part of the problem. Look at the devious role of "Engage," the British group of academics who protested the boycott but had a role in creating the very climate which brought the boycott about.

I have had an exchange with Professor David Hirsch, who heads "Engage." When I remarked that even if the boycott were to be overturned, it would not obviate the fact that so many British academics are anti-Semitic, Professor Hirsch responded: "I think that most people who voted for the boycott did so because they didn't understand the issues properly. They reacted to the 'Israel is apartheid, so boycott it' argument because they wanted to 'do something to help the Palestinians.' There are anti-Semites behind the campaign, but not everybody who supported these bans were anti-Semites. Some were just ignorant -- and we are doing everything we can to change that."

I challenged the notion that the boycott participants were not anti-Semites and remarked on the appalling ignorance of those teachers. This clearly annoyed Professor Hirsch and elicited an e-mail which he copied to several academics who had joined the debate on my side.

"Yes, many of them are teachers, some of them teach Math and biology... they have no special knowledge of Israel. Many of them, too, are administration staff, library workers etc. They didn't think they were acting to help the enemies of Israel: they thought they were acting to help innocent Palestinians who are living very difficult lives under Israeli occupation. Don't make allowances for anti-Semites—but do think clearly."

Well that annoyed me, perhaps igniting a forme fruste of feminism, so I did a bit of homework on this organization known as "Engage." I had become



suspicious when Hirsch wrote on April 22, 2005 about the infamous Ilan Pappé: "Pappé remains in his job, in spite of the fact that his views are extremely unpopular in Israeli society. Let us hope that the university continues to respect his tenure, as it is now doing." Then, confirming my suspicions, Professor Hirsch sent out an e-mail describing "Engage." Following are excerpts. (The entire text may be read on the organization's website: www.liberoblog.com.)

"Engage opposes Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. We are in favor of the foundation of a Palestinian state alongside the state of Israel.

"Israel is not illegitimate in the sense that the white apartheid state in South Africa was. It is the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza that is illegitimate, and the discrimination against Palestinians that is illegitimate, not the existence of Israel.

"Engage wants to bring together academics and cultural producers in solidarity against the occupation.

"Opposing the sometimes brutal actions of the Israeli government and army is not anti-Semitic. But, sometimes anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism.

"Zionism is not racism. Zionism is Jewish nationalism and it is not fundamentally different from other forms of nationalism. Nationalism often leads to racism, but nationalism is not the same thing as racism. The Zionism is Racism (or Zionism is Apartheid) claim is problematic because it understands Jewish nationalism to be necessarily and incurably much worse than any other nationalism on the face of the earth.

"And Jewish nationalism has a plurality of traditions, some actively and consistently anti-racist, others shamefully racist and Islam-phobic, most somewhere in between.

So, here is what I wrote to Professor Hirsch.

Dear Sir:

You really ought to consider changing the name of your little group, ostensibly set up to protest the boycott. The title "Engage" is far more fitting. You burnish your credentials as a protester by indulging in the same anti-Israel claptrap that drives the boycott itself. The links on your site give you away. Among the more egregious are Jews for Justice for Palestinians, Friends of Bir Zeit University, Yesh Gvul, B'Tselem, Refuser Solidarity Network, and a host of groups that promote the rights of Israel's enemies and even encourage soldiers to resist.

The "occupation" upsets you as does the "discrimination" against Palestinian Arabs. Not a peep from you about the poor Palestinian Jews whose daily life is tormented by fear of a terrorist act carried out by the people whose discomfort exercises you so much.

It never seems to cross your mind to ask why the local Arabs have to pass checkpoints; why poll after poll discloses that Palestinian Arabs overwhelmingly support terrorism; why the "poor" Palestinian Arabs accept money to sacrifice their young in suicide missions; why the Palestinian Arabs are in a wretched state and who put them there.

Given your great compassion for Palestinian Arabs, why do you fail to mention that their lot under Israeli control was far better than in any Arab country including Jordan where a Hashemite rules over 82% of Mandated Palestine?

You claim that your organization wants to inform, but you promote anti-Israel disinformation instead. To have you lead an anti-boycott group is akin to a fox guarding the hen house.

You should read an article on the Israel Insider webpage "Plain, Old Jew Hatred." The author David Meir Levi, excoriating the boycott, writes: "...a growing number of academics and liberal leaders, erstwhile paragons of the pursuit for truth, working unfettered in the bastions of free speech, have adopted this newly revised edition of Jew-hatred as a cornerstone in their prejudiced fight for justice. These putative defenders of our social and political systems, which for centuries have been defined as having malice toward none and equal opportunity of access for all, have incorporated the new euphemisms of Jew-hatred into their publications, speeches, and classrooms...much to the bewilderment of many, and to the glee of a hate-driven few.

"And perhaps most odd of all, they have done so of their own free will, enthusiastically exploiting their faculty status and academic freedom to proffer anti-Israel propaganda as scholarship and anti-Zionist polemic as education. Their criminal misuse of their positions of trust among colleagues, students, and society at large, has contributed directly to the creation on many campuses of an atmosphere of hate and distrust toward Israel, Israelis, Jews, and anyone identifying with any of the above."

How sad, Professor Hirsch, that this describes you as well as the boycotters. When the rising tide of European anti-Semitism starts to lap at your ankles, the anti-Semites you and your Jewish cohorts gratify with your anti-Israel statements will ignore you. Although you helped implement their agenda you will no longer be a "useful"....er...professor.

The truth is that you will have no one but yourselves to blame -- because of your inability to think clearly.

Yours truly,

Ruth

**Professor Hirsch,
to have you lead
an anti-boycott
group is akin to a
fox guarding the
hen house.**

(Continued from page 2)

sued Fallaci, claiming her book is offensive to Muslims.

As Ali Sina sees it, Europe treads a dangerous path, with two likely undesirable outcomes: 1. Islam is left alone to grow unchecked, which means Europe will succumb to Islamism before the end of this century or 2) The Europeans sense the danger too late, panic and give birth to Eurofascism to counter Islamofascism.

Egypt's Noose Tightens

As Jerusalem-based writer P. David Hornik points out: "To cap off the unfolding security nightmare [following "disengagement"], Israel's Deputy Prime Minister Ehud Olmert has said that "Israel is willing to gradually give up control of the Rafah crossing between Egypt and the Gaza Strip (the Philadelphi corridor), handing it over to the Egyptians within a few months of...disengagement."

Yuval Steinitz, chairman of the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, compares this most recent folly of the Sharon government to the decision of the ancient Greeks to allow the Trojan horse to enter their city. "The strategic blindness of both decisions is equally complete" says Steinitz.

Egypt's Foreign Minister Aboul Gheit has already said Egypt plans to deploy 1,500 to 2000 troops along its border with Israel. Hornik sums up: "According to the 1979 Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, Egypt was only allowed to deploy lightly-armed civilian

police along its border with Israel. The newly planned contingent, however, is supposed to consist of border guards or, as Gheit put it, 'strong enough forces to control that part of the border.' In other words, it sounds as if the sole lasting achievement of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty -- the demilitarization of Sinai -- is well on the way to unraveling. It sounds, that is, like territorial continuity for *jihad* from Cairo to the Negev."

Hats Off to Dov Hikind

In solidarity with the communities of Gush Katif, New York State Assemblyman Dov Hikind, whom we honored at AFSI's national conference several years ago, has gone to Gaza to remain with the embattled communities there through their forcible expulsion by the Sharon government.

Clear-thinking Women

It is striking the extent to which the most eloquent and clear-thinking champions of Israel, within Israel, are women. Caroline Glick is perhaps the best known outside Israel but there are the intellectually equally formidable Sarah Honig, Evelyn Gordon, Ruthie Blum and Naomi Ragen. Their contribution is the more striking given the mental collapse of so many of Israel's most gifted male defenders in this country. People like Norman Podhoretz, Charles Krauthammer and William Safire have (we hope only temporarily) abjured thinking altogether, in favor of a blind belief in President Bush and Prime Minister Sharon.

Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, N.Y.
Permit No. 9418